REMARKS

As may be appreciated from the above listing of claims, the claims presented herein have been amended. The amended claims are supported by at least Figures 1-5, and other portions of the specification. For example, paragraphs 19-22 support the amendments to the claims made herein.

In the Office Action of June 29, 2010, the Examiner made comments with respect to the claimed subject matter in pages 14-15 of the Office Action. The amendments made herein take the comments made on pages 14-15 of the Office Action into consideration. Applicants thank the Examiner for the thoughtful feedback provided in the Office Action. The feedback was much appreciated and Applicants believe that this feedback helped clarify issues and will expedite examination.

No additional fees are believed to be necessary. To the extent additional fees are necessary, authorization is provided herewith to pay such additional fees via Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

I. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action dated June 29, 2010 (hereafter "Office Action") the Examiner objected to line 12 of paragraph 19 of the Specification and stated that the term "be" should be changed to the term "been." (Office Action, at 2).

This change has already been made in the Amendment dated April 12, 2010. In that amendment, paragraph 19 was amended as follows (emphasis added to highlight the previously made amendment of "be" to "been" as suggested in the Office Action):

> FIG. 4 shows an exploded view of the inventive housing 1. The communication system is now assembled so that the main printed

circuit board 8 is placed on a surrounding support edge 22 of the base housing part 2 and the cover part 4 is placed on it (the guides 7 are used to guide the circuit board and the cover part 4 on assembly). When the cover part 4 is lowered, the locking clips 29 are deflected by the base part 2. In a lowered position of the cover part 4 the locking clips 29 engage in corresponding locking tabs of the cover 4. In the locked state the main printed circuit board 8 is clamped between the base housing part 2 and the cover part 4. The sequence then continues with the first hood 5 being put on, the attachment tabs 9 being inserted and connected by means of the connection 39 (FIG. 3) to the cover part 4. The clip connection 39 can be released again by the maintenance personnel of the communication system using a tool such as a ~~screwdriver.~~ screwdriver A as may be seen in FIG. 6. However the mounting area 12 (FIG. 3) of the extension circuit board 18 remains inaccessible for the user. **After the first hood 5 has been ~~be~~ fitted, the second hood 6 is installed in a last step of assembly.** This involves pushing the hood 6 onto the connection area in the direction of the arrow 31 and latching it by means snap-in hook 37 (FIG. 5) to cover part 4. This is done by turning it counterclockwise and does not require a mechanical tool. The twist locks 21 assists in latching in the hood 6. This construction allows the second hood 6 to be easily removed manually and makes the connection area easily accessible from the user side.

Because the Specification no longer has the term "be" that was objected to in the Office Action based on the Amendment of April 12, 2010, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

II. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 13, 20, 30 And 32

Claims 13, 20, 30 and 32 were objected to for various informalities. (Office Action at 2-3).

For instance, claim 20 was objected to for use of the term "each aperture". Claim 20 has been amended to resolve the basis for the objection of claim 20.

Claim 30 was objected to for using the term "tool" instead of the term "mechanical tool". Claim 30 has been amended to use the term "mechanical tool". (Office Action, at 3).

Claim 32 has been cancelled. This resolves any objection to claim 32.

Claim 13 was objected to for not including the term "one" in the phrase 'at least aperture". Claim 13 has been amended to correct this typographical error.

Claim 13 was also objected to for being confusing to the Examiner because of an unlocking that occurs via use of a mechanical tool. As amended, claim 13 requires the first hood to only be releasable from the cover portion after the at least one attachment mechanism and at least one clip connection mechanism are interlocked by use of a mechanical tool to release the first hood from the cover portion. The amendment to claim 13 is believed to address and resolve the objection made by the Examiner.

For at least the above reasons, the claims as amended herein resolve the bases for the objections. It is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS OF THE PENDING CLAIMS

The Examiner rejected claims 13-19, 21-23, 26-29 and 32 as obvious in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0073338 to Sumer et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,716,499 to Bhargava. (Office Action, at 4).

Claim 20 was rejected as obvious in view of Sumer et al., Bhargava and U.S. Patent No. 6,078,661 to Arnett et al. (Office Action, at 10).

Claims 24-25 were rejected as obvious in view of Sumer et al., Bhargava and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0050771 to Krispin et al. (Office Action, at 11).

Claims 30-31 were rejected as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,749,359 to White. (Office Action, at 12).

A. Burden Of Proving Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

"**All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art**." MPEP § 2143.03 (emphasis added). "When evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, **all the limitations of the claims must be considered and given weight**." MPEP 2143.03. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." *Id.* "A 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is based on 35 U.S.C. 102(a), 102(b), 102(e), etc. depending on the type of prior art reference used and its publication or issue date." MPEP § 2141.01.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness an Examiner must show that an invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. MPEP § 2141. "Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries." *Id.* The factual inquiries enunciated by the Court include "ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art" and "resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art." MPEP § 2141.

"A statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been 'well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made' because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. MPEP § 2143.01. "[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead**, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of**

obviousness." MPEP § 2143.01 (citing *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 14, 82 USPQ2d at 1396) (emphasis added).

Moreover, "[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious." MPEP § 2143.01. Also, "the proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose." MPEP § 2143.01.

B. Claims 13-32 Are Allowable Over The Cited Art

1. Claims 13-19, 21-23, And 26-29 Are Allowable

Claim 13 requires a device to include a housing that includes a connection area configured to be at least partially accessible from outside of the housing and a housing cover that includes a first hood and a cover portion. The first hood has one or more apertures and at least one attachment mechanism. The cover portion has at least one clip connection mechanism sized and configured to releasably retain the at least one attachment mechanism of the first hood. The housing also includes a base housing part and a printed circuit board arranged between the base housing part and the cover portion. The printed circuit board has an extension area, comprised of at least one first plug-in device for a first extension printed circuit board. The at least one first plug-in device comprises a first plug-in device that is mechanically connected to a first extension circuit board. The first extension circuit board is at least partially supported on at least one guide attached to the cover portion. The first extension circuit board also has at least one second plug-in device that is positioned in the at least one aperture. The at least one second plug-in device of the first extension circuit board is configured for connection of system terminations. The cover

portion is configured to releasably attach to the base housing part and is configured to clamp at least a portion of the printed circuit board against the base housing part when the cover portion is attached to the base housing part. The first hood is only releasable from the cover portion after the at least one attachment mechanism and at least one clip connection mechanism are interlocked by use of a mechanical tool to unlock the first hood from the cover portion. Claims 14-28 and 30-31 depend directly or indirectly from claim 13 and therefore also contain the limitations of claim 13.

a. Sumer et al. Do Not Teach Or Suggest Plug-in Devices

The Examiner reads Sumer et al. as disclosing plug-in devices at elements 147, 149 and 151. However, as Sumer et al. make clear, these elements are plugs, not plug-in devices. Plugs are not plug-in devices. Plug-in devices are devices configured to receive extension boards. This is made clear by the explicit text of claim 13, which requires at least one first plug-in device to be mechanically connected to a first extension printed circuit board." This is also clear from the specification, which teaches that "Extension circuit boards are plugged into the plug-in devices 23."

The plugs 147, 149 and 151 are not for receiving extension printed circuit boards. Indeed, as taught by Sumer et al., circuit boards 146, 148 and 150 are all integral to each other. Specifically, the boards are part of an "integrated access device 145". (Col. 5, lines 1-5). Plugs 147, 149 and 151 of Sumer et al. are configured to connect to jacks 126 or terminal strip 118 via wires 131 (*See e.g.* Figure 2).

Sumer et al. do not teach or suggest any plug-in device for an extension circuit board. Indeed, as Sumer et al. teach, boards 146, 148 and 150 are all one device. There are no extension boards attached to board 146.

b. Sumer et al. Do Not Teach Any Release Caused By Interlocking Via Use Of A Mechanical Tool

The pending claims require the first hood to only be releasable from the cover portion after the at least one attachment mechanism and at least one clip connection mechanism are **interlocked by use of a mechanical tool.** The Examiner admitted in the Office Action that Sumer et al. do not disclose any mechanical tool nor such releasing using a mechanical tool.

Indeed, Sumer et al. specifically teach that latch 104 "enables cover 102 to be opened without a tool." (Col. 3, lines 33-34). A mechanical tool is something other than a human body part. For example, the definition of tool is "a handheld device that aids in accomplishing a task." Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, *available at* http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tool. As is clear from the ordinary meaning of the term "tool" and Sumer et al., a human finger is not a mechanical tool and cannot read on the tool limitation recited in claim 13. In fact, Sumer et al. teach away from a first hood that is releasable from a cover portion after one or more attachment mechanisms and one or more clip connection mechanisms of those components are interlocked via use of a mechanical tool.

None of the cited art alone or in any combination teach or suggest all the limitations of the pending claims. The pending claims are therefore allowable over the cited art.

2. Claims 17 and 18 Are Independently Allowable

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 13 and are therefore allowable because claim 13 is allowable. Moreover, claims 17 and 18 include additional limitations that are not taught by

Sumer et al. or the other cited art. Claims 17 and 18 require "the printed circuit board includes a second plug-in device that establishes an electrical connection with a second extension printed circuit board." Sumer et al. do not teach such a plug-in device.

The Examiner contends that plugs 126 are second plug-in devices of an extension circuit board. (Office Action, at 7). To the contrary, plugs 126 are not plug in devices of any extension circuit board. Plugs 126 are jacks that are connected to pivot connectors 122 of an integrated access device 145 (¶ 43) and the circuit board 146 of the integrated access device, which has the jacks 126, terminal strip 122 and pivot connectors 122 soldered thereon. (¶ 43). The jacks 126 are not plug-in devices of any extension circuit board.

3. Claim 14 Is Independently Allowable

Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and also requires the housing to include a second hood. The second hood is adapted to be releasably connected to the cover portion. The second hood covers the connection area when the second hood is connected to the cover portion. Claim 14 also requires the at least one attachment mechanism to be comprised of at least one attachment tab that is insertable into and connected to the at least one clip connection mechanism to form a clip connection. The clip connection being unlockable and releaseable by the use of the mechanical tool to unlock the first hood from the cover portion and release the first hood from the cover portion.

None of the cited art teaches any one or more attachment mechanisms of a first hood that include one or more attachment tabs that are insertable into one or more clip connection mechanisms for forming a clip connection that is unlocakkble and releasable by the use of the mechanical tool. As noted above, Sumer et al. do not teach or suggest any unlockable

connection that is unlockable via the mechanical tool. Further, none of the other cited art teaches or suggests any attachment tab or clip connection mechanism as required by claim 14. Bhargava for example, does not teach or suggest any such mechanisms. As another example, White and Krispin et al. do not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 14.

Claims 15-17, 21-27 and 30-31 depend directly or indirectly from claim 14 and also include the limitations of claim 14. These claims are also allowable over the cited art.

4. Claims 15-16 Are Allowable

Claim 15 depends from claim 13 and claim 16 depends from claim 14. Both of claims 15 and 16 require that the base housing part includes at least one second guide and a support edge. The at least one second guide guides the printed circuit board and the cover portion during assembly by being fit within a portion of the cover portion. The printed circuit board is arranged between the support edge and the cover portion.

The Examiner cites holes in the plate 144 of Sumer et al. as being guides. To the contrary, holes provide no guidance to any structural mechanism during installation. There is no guiding during assembly provided by holes such that any guide is fit within a portion of a cover portion. In fact, holes in plate 144 are not sized to fit within any portion of the device disclosed by Sumer et al. In fact, Sumer et al. is silent with respect to the functioning of the cited holes. Presumably, those holes are used in the process of making the plates 144.

If the Examiner refers to the keyhole shaped holes in plate 144, those holes are clearly not used for any guiding, but are used to mount the device to a wall. (*See e.g.* Office Action, at 9). The holes of plate 144 are not any second guide as required by claims 15 and 16.

In fact, none of the cited art teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 15 and 16. These claims are allowable over the cited art.

C. Claims 20, 24-25, And 30-31 Are Allowable

Claims 20, 24-25 and 30-31 depend directly or indirectly from claim 13. These claims are allowable at least because claim 13 is allowable.

D. The Claims Are Not Rendered Obvious In View Of The Cited Art

The invention described in the present application has been found to contain allowable subject matter in other countries. For example, European Patent No. EP1652389 is related to the present application and was granted to Applicants. The Examiner was previously provided with a copy of EP1652389 with the Amendment dated April 17, 2009.

Further, it is clear that Sumer et al. alone or in combination with any of the other cited art do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the pending claims. As acknowledged by the European Patent Office the pending claims are patentable over the prior art.

III. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ralph G. Fischer/

Dated: September 28, 2010

Ralph G. Fischer
Registration No. 55,179
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

(412) 392-2121

Attorney for Applicant